

Administrative Determination (AD)
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

- A. BLM Office:** Anchorage Field Office **Lease/Serial/Case File No.** AA-077729
Proposed Action Title/Type: CCSC Parking Lot Addition
Location of Proposed Action: Campbell Tract; Seward Meridian, T. 12 N., R. 3 W.,
Section 3; USGS topographic map Anchorage A-8.

Description of the Proposed Action:

The Proposed Action is to expand the Campbell Creek Science Center employee parking area through the addition of four vehicle spaces. This addition is required in order to accommodate increased staff and administrative parking needs at the Science Center. These four designated vehicle spaces will be located south of the current employee/administrative parking area, immediately south of the southern-most vehicle service entrance to the Science Center. The Proposed Action will result in a footprint 42 feet long by 18 feet deep as measured from the edge of the existing tarmac. Each parking space will measure 10 feet wide and 18 feet long and be backed by a concrete or hard rubber stop. Most of the proposed parking area will lay on a previously leveled and impacted strip adjacent to the road. An existing three foot high earth berm will be cut back and partially removed at the west end of the proposed parking area. One tree (10" diameter aspen), also located at the west end of the area may require cutting although efforts will be made to try and leave the tree in place. The berm and area will be leveled using mechanical equipment, and a gravel pad will be installed utilizing existing gravel stocks. Work will be performed utilizing in-house and volunteer labor. Construction is planned to occur in September 2002.

Applicant (if any): BLM

- B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans**

LUP Name: *Southcentral Management Framework Plan*
Date Approved: March 1980

Other document: *A Management Plan for Public Use and Resource Management on the Bureau of Land Management Campbell Tract Facility*
Date Approved: June 1988

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions: Activity Objectives - Recreation (R-3) and Wildlife (WL-4)

Administrative Determination (AD) (Contd.)

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the Proposed Action.

EA-AK-040-8025: *Environmental Assessment: Public Use and Resource Management on the Bureau of Land Management Campbell Tract Facility*. This document is on file in the Anchorage Field Office.

EA-AK-040-92-003: *Campbell Creek Environmental Education Center Development Plan and Environmental Assessment*, February 1993. This document is on file in the Anchorage Field Office.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**1. Is the current Proposed Action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?**

Yes. The current Proposed Action conforms with the intent of the development plan and environmental assessment prepared for the development of the environmental education center (1993), and *A Management Plan for Public Use and Resource Management on the Bureau of Land Management Campbell Tract Facility* (1988). The proposed activities are either the same or substantially the same activities as described in the above listed EA. The proposed parking lot expansion is within the established access road corridor on lands previously cleared and disturbed by military activities and described in the EA. The 18 by 42 foot footprint of the parking area extends 18 feet from the edge of the paved road on an area already leveled by previous road construction activities.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current Proposed Action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?

Yes. Additional alternatives beyond the No Action Alternative were not viewed as necessary at the time of the analysis.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife Service lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the Proposed Action?

Yes. The circumstances have not changed. The management goals of the 1988 management plan remain the same, and today's recreational uses and interests

Administrative Determination (AD) (Contd.)

remain basically identical to those of 1988 and 1993.

4. **Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current Proposed Action?**
Yes. The approach used in the previous documents is appropriate. The analysis in the documents is similar to what would be appropriate for the Proposed Action. User groups and BLM's management decisions have changed little since 1988 and 1993.
5. **Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current Proposed Action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current Proposed Action?**
Yes. The impacts of the Proposed Action are unchanged from the existing NEPA documentation.

No additional direct or indirect impacts have been identified for the Proposed Action. The above listed environmental assessments examined the operation plans for the specific site in question. The parking lot addition is substantially the same Proposed Action analyzed in EA-AK-040-8025 and in EA-AK-040-92-003. Thus, the site specific analysis is substantially the same.
6. **Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current Proposed Action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?**
Yes. The cumulative impacts are unchanged from the impacts that were analyzed in the existing NEPA documents. The Proposed Action is a more formal expansion on a site already impacted by previous construction and adequately described in the above cited NEPA documentation.
7. **Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current Proposed Action?**
Yes. The Proposed Action occurs in an administrative area generally closed to the public. Public involvement was adequately addressed in the above NEPA documents for the Science Center site area.

Administrative Determination (AD) (Contd.)

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:

Doug Ballou, Lead Preparer

Also, see the attached NEPA routing form.

F. Mitigation Measures:

No mitigation measures are required. The parking lot site is adjacent to the paved administrative access road to the Science Center and has been impacted by informal parking activity. The Proposed Action hardens the site and prevents encroachment of vehicles beyond the formal parking area with gravel and barriers.

G. Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

/s/ June Bailey
Anchorage Field Manager, Acting

10-16-02
Date